

REMARKS**Status of the Claims**

Claims 1, 4-7, 10-13, and 16-18 are currently present in the Application, and claims 1, 7, and 13 are independent claims. Applicants have amended claims 1, 7, 13, and 17 and canceled claims 2, 3, 8, 9, 14, and 15 in this Supplemental Response. Applicants are not conceding in this Application that those claims are not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner, as the present claim amendments and cancellations are only for facilitating expeditious prosecution of the present Application. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue these and other claims in one or more continuations and/or divisional patent applications.

In particular, Applicants have amended independent claim 1 to include limitations previously found in dependent claims 2 and 3, and have therefore canceled claims 2 and 3. Similarly, Applicants have amended independent claims 7 and 13 to include limitations previously found in dependent claims 8 and 9, and 14 and 15, respectively, and have therefore canceled claims 8, 9, 14, and 15.

Examiner Interview

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the courtesy extended to Applicants' attorney during the telephone interview on May 25, 2007. During the interview, Applicants' attorney proposed amending the independent claims to focus on grouping elements into containers, and then determining whether or not to display a container based on the element properties associated with the container. The Examiner indicated that he would perform further searching after receiving Applicants' Supplemental Response.

Drawings

Applicants note that the Office Action does not indicate whether the formal drawings, filed with the Application on February 2, 2004, are accepted by the Examiner. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner indicate whether the drawings are accepted in the next Office Action.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 13-18 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicants have canceled claim 21, and therefore the rejection of claim 21 is moot. Applicants amended claims 13-18 in the Response submitted on April 3, 2007, and therefore, respectfully submit that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101 have been overcome, and respectfully request that they be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - Alleged Anticipation Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Fernandez et al., U.S. Patent Publication Number 2005/0044504 (hereinafter Fernandez). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Note that claims 2, 3, 8, 9, 14, 15, and 19-21 have been canceled, and therefore the rejections to these claims is now moot.

To anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim (Manual of Patent Examining Procedure § 2131). Applicants teach and claim excluding graphical containers, containing elements, from a display screen, depending upon the type of device being used. In particular, certain graphical containers and their elements are excluded based on the size of the display screen. Fernandez purports to teach modifying the appearance of user interface components, a process commonly referred to as “skinning” (Fernandez, paragraph [0015]). Applicants respectfully submit that Fernandez does not anticipate Applicants’ independent claims, as amended, because Fernandez does not teach every element of independent claims 1, 7, and 13. Using independent claim 1 as an exemplary claim, Applicants teach and claim the following:

- grouping a first set of elements, selected from a plurality of elements, into a first container, wherein each of the plurality of elements and the first container are adapted to be displayed on a display device;
- grouping a second plurality of elements, selected from the plurality of elements, into a second container, wherein the second container is adapted to be displayed on the display device;

- associating a first set of element properties, selected from a plurality of element properties, to the first container and a second set of element properties, selected from the plurality of element properties, to the second container, wherein at least one of the plurality of element properties is an excluded environment identifier;
- identifying one or more display environment identifiers corresponding to the display device, wherein a first display environment identifier corresponds to a size of a display screen of the display device;
- comparing the display environment identifiers with the first set of element properties and the second set of element properties;
- in response to the comparing, determining that the first container has a first excluded environment identifier that matches the first display environment identifier for the display device;
- in response to the comparing, determining that the second container does not have any excluded environment identifiers that match the first display environment identifier for the display device; and
- in response to the determinations, displaying, on the display device, one or more of the elements, wherein the first container and the first set of elements are not displayed and wherein the second container and the second set of elements are displayed.

Applicants teach and claim grouping elements into containers where both the containers and their elements “are adapted to be displayed on a display device.” Element properties are associated with each container, and an element property may be “an excluded environment identifier.” Applicants further teach and claim that there are “one or more display environment identifiers corresponding to the display device, wherein a first display environment identifier corresponds to a size of a display screen of the display device.” If a first container includes a first excluded environment identifier

(as one of its element properties) that matches the first display environment identifier (i.e. the display environment identifier that is specifically claimed to correspond to the size of the display screen) for the display device, then the first container and its elements **are not** displayed. On the other hand, if a second container does not have any excluded environment identifiers (as any of its element properties) that match the first display environment identifier (i.e. the display environment identifier that is specifically claimed to correspond to the size of the display screen) for the display device, then the second container and its elements **are** displayed.

In contrast to Applicants' claimed invention, Fernandez discloses modifying the appearance of user interface components (Fernandez, paragraph [0015]), but does not determine which container and elements are to be displayed and which containers and elements are not to be displayed. In particular, Fernandez does not identify display environment identifiers corresponding to a display device, where "a first display environment identifier corresponds to a size of a display screen of the display device," as taught and claimed by Applicants. Fernandez does not appear to be concerned with the size of a device's display screen.

Fernandez also does not teach comparing the device's display environment identifiers with the element properties associated with various containers and then determining which containers and elements to display based on this comparison, as taught and claimed by Applicants. In particular, Fernandez does not teach "determining that the first container has a first excluded environment identifier that matches the first display environment identifier for the display device," "determining that the second container does not have any excluded environment identifiers that match the first display environment identifier for the display device," and then "displaying, on the display device, one or more of the elements, **wherein the first container and the first set of elements are not displayed and wherein the second container and the second set of elements are displayed,**" as taught and claimed by Applicants. In contrast, Fernandez appears to display every element. According to Fernandez, "a control author may define a custom theme schema . . . The custom theme schema may define enumerations, properties, parts, and states **in addition to** those defined in the

system schema field, thereby ***effectively extending the system or base theme schema***” (Fernandez, paragraph [0046]). The custom theme schemas disclosed by Fernandez may add to a base schema, but Fernandez does not exclude containers and elements from being displayed on a display device. As discussed in Fernandez, a theme manager displays a common control “in accordance with the base schema,” and displays a custom control “in accordance with the custom schema” (Fernandez, paragraphs [0048] and [0049]). However, Fernandez does not discuss any situation where controls, or any other type of elements, are not displayed. In particular, Fernandez does not make a decision to exclude any container or elements from display based on a comparison of the container’s element properties with display environment identifiers.

The Office Action cites Fernandez at paragraphs [0019], [0025], and [0035] as disclosing refraining from displaying a container and a plurality of grouped elements on a display device (see Office Action, page 3, paragraph 8). However, Applicants respectfully disagree that the cited portions of Fernandez disclose these elements of Applicants’ independent claims. Rather, paragraph [0019] of Fernandez discusses system components, such as hardware components and BIOS. Paragraph [0025] of Fernandez discusses the layout of a schema file, such as SchemaDef.h, which appears to include the definitions needed to build a theme manager schema. Paragraph [0035] of Fernandez discusses that a “system schema file may also include a section containing the name of user interface control classes, along with their part and state declarations, also referred to herein as declarations or definitions of parts and states.” However, a close reading of Fernandez does not reveal any discussion or disclosure of refraining from displaying a container and its elements.

Based on the above discussion, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 7, and 13, and the claims which depend from them, are not anticipated by Fernandez, and respectfully request that they be allowed.

Conclusion

As a result of the foregoing, it is asserted by Applicants that the remaining claims in the Application are in condition for allowance, and Applicants respectfully request an early allowance of such claims.

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner contact the Applicants' attorney listed below if the Examiner believes that such a discussion would be helpful in resolving any remaining questions or issues related to this Application.

Respectfully submitted,

By /Leslie A. Van Leeuwen, Reg. No. 42,196/

Leslie A. Van Leeuwen, Reg. No. 42,196

Van Leeuwen & Van Leeuwen

Attorneys for Applicant

Telephone: (512) 301-6738

Facsimile: (512) 301-6742